Barley	580,059
Oats	263,683
Sorghum	1,837
Total base acres	2,118,042

Total annual erosion reduction: 45,842,990 tons.

The future of this program is central to the debate over the 1995 farm bill in my State.

The legislation we are introducing today represents our effort to address the questions of participants in our States and many others who have concerns about the future of CRP: farm implement dealers, fertilizer and pesticide companies, local business people, lenders, conservationists, ranchers, hunters, and various other parties.

Recently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture made two significant announcements that signal its intentions over the future of the CRP. On August 24, 1994, USDA announced 1-year contract extensions to participants whose contract expires on September 30, 1995.

On December 14, 1994, USDA announced that action would be taken to modify and extend all CRP contracts and to improve the targeting of the CRP to more environmentally sensitive acres.

As a result of these announcements, the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] adjusted its baseline projections for CRP spending. However, the new baseline suggests that the new CRP will shrink to less than half its size, about 15 million acres.

I believe a 15-million acre CRP is insufficient to maintain the broad benefits of the program. Passage of this legislation is necessary to maintain program benefits.

First, environmental benefits will be lost. As I noted, he CRP provides outstanding improvements in water quality, soil quality, and wildlife habitat. Even more benefits could be gained through enactment of our bill. A mistake was made once before in allowing a similar program, the soil bank, to expire. From 1956 to 1972, USDA managed the soil bank, to divert cropland from production in order to reduce inventories, and to establish and maintain protective vegetative cover on the land. In 1960, there were 28.7 million acres under contract. Although many forces were at work in ending the program such as commodity prices in the world market, by the mid-1970's most land had returned to crop production. Many of those acres are now enrolled in the CRP.

Second, commodity prices will likely fall. As CRP contracts expire, several surveys have shown that a majority of farmers will return the land to production, increasing stocks and depressing prices. According to USDA's Economic Research Service, wheat prices would fall 9 percent; corn prices would fall 5 percent. Lower prices and increased acreage receiving payments would increase total deficiency payments 21 percent.

Third, the debate over the 1995 farm bill could become an increasingly difficult budget fight. Some members of Congress continually suggest that Federal farm programs should be cut significantly to solve our budget deficit. I disagree. Agriculture spending has been cut significantly in recent years. If other Federal programs had taken the same reductions agriculture has, our deficit problem would be much less serious, if not solved. If we fail to fully extend the CRP, the budget pressures on agriculture will very likely increase dramatically, threatening farm income that is already at insufficient levels.

Fourth, the combination of lower prices and the loss of rental payments will have serious financial implications for producers and landowners in North Dakota and many other States. If, as some of my colleagues have suggested, the CRP is significantly downsized at the same time farm programs are eliminated, the combined impact would seriously erode land values, and hurt rural schools, businesses and communities, and lending institutions.

I believe that is the wrong approach to Federal agriculture policy. I believe the CRP is an important part of a long-term strategy to maintaining a sound rural economy. The bill I am introducing would lead us in that direction by accomplishing the following:

Requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to offer current contract holders the option of renewing their current contract for 10 years upon expiration. Acreage not reenrolled would be required to follow a basic conservation plan.

Requiring the Secretary to use a bidding system to enroll new acres into the CRP with cost-share assistance available for carrying out conservation measures and practices. Three criteria shall be used by USDA to determine new enrollment: water quality, soil quality, and wildlife habitat.

By moving forward on such a policy, it is my belief that we will be making better long-term decisions for this valuable national resource. The benefits to society in improved water and soil quality and wildlife habitat are real and measurable. Let us not repeat the errors of the past when the soil bank was cavalierly eliminated.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage savings and investment through individual retirement accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to establish a temporary moratorium on the Interagency Memorandum of Agreement Concerning Wetlands Determinations until enactment of a law that is the successor to the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 285

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to grant authority to provide social services block grants directly to Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to elevate the position of Director of Indian Health Service to Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, to provide for the organizational independence of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes.

S. 324

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from the definition of employee firefighters and rescue squad workers who perform volunteer services and to prevent employers from requiring employees who are firefighters or rescue squad workers to perform volunteer services, and to allow an employer not to pay overtime compensation to a firefighter or rescue squad worker who performs volunteer services for the employer, and for other purposes.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 348, a bill to provide for a review by the Congress of rules promulgated by agencies, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

[Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, a concurrent resolution relative to Taiwan and the United Nations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6—RELATIVE TO MEXICO

Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BOND, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. FRIST, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. GRAMM) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 6

Whereas Mexico is an important neighbor and trading partner of the United States;

Whereas on January 31, 1995, the President announced a program of assistance to Mexico, that includes swap facilities and securities guarantees in the amount of $20,000,000,000, using the exchange stabilization fund established pursuant to section 5302 of title 31, United States Code and the Federal Reserve System;

Whereas the program of assistance also involves the participation of the Federal Reserve System, the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Bank of Canada, and several Latin American countries;

Whereas the involvement of the exchange stabilization fund and the Federal Reserve System means that United States taxpayer funds will be used in the assistance effort to Mexico;

Whereas assistance provided by the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Inter-American Development Bank may require additional United States contributions of taxpayer funds to those entities;

Whereas the immediate use of taxpayer funds and the potential requirement for additional future United States contributions of taxpayer funds necessitates congressional oversight of the disbursement of funds from the exchange stabilization fund, the Federal Reserve System, and the International Monetary Fund; and

Whereas the efficacy of the assistance to Mexico is contingent on the pursuit of sound economic policy by the Government of Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury should, in conjunction with reports required under section 5302 of title 31, United States Code, by te 30th day after the end of each month, submit a detailed report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives describing, with respect to such month—

(A) the condition of the Mexican economy;

(B) any consultations between the Government of Mexico and the Department of the Treasury or the International Monetary Fund; and

(C) any funds disbursed from the exchange stabilization fund, including any swap facilities or securities guarantees, pursuant to the approval of the President issued on January 31, 1995;

(2) each report submitted under paragraph (1) should include, with respect to the month for which the report is submitted—

(A) a full description of the activities of the Mexican Central Bank and Mexican exchange rate policy, including the reserve positions of the Mexican Central Bank and data relating to the functioning of Mexican monetary policy;

(B) information regarding the implementation and the extent of wage, price, and credit controls in the Mexican economy;

(C) a complete documentation of Mexican tax policy and any proposed changes to such policy;

(D) a list of planned or pending Mexican Government regulations affecting the Mexican private sector;

(E) any efforts to privatize public sector entities in Mexico; and

(F) a full disclosure of all financial transactions, both inside and outside of Mexico, directly involving funds disbursed from the exchange stabilization fund and the International Monetary Fund, including transactions with—

(i) individuals;

(ii) partnerships;

(iii) joint ventures; and

(iv) corporations; and

(3) the Secretary of the Treasury should continue to submit reports under paragraph (1) until the Secretary determines that no further risk exists to United States taxpayers of default by the Government of Mexico on funds provided from the exchange stabilization fund, the Federal Reserve System, or the International Monetary Fund pursuant to the program of assistance approved by the President on January 31, 1995.

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, President Clinton arranged a financial package for Mexico. The package involves the exchange stabilization fund, the International Monetary Fund, the Federal Reserve, and other international organizations and governments to help Mexico get through its liquidity crisis. There is no doubt that the United States has a great interest in the health of Mexico's economy. We are concerned about Mexico, not only as a trading partner but as a good neighbor. This particular financial package expands that relationship. Indeed, it puts U.S. tax dollars at risk, and Congress needs to play an oversight role.

I am concerned that Mexico's problems leading to this financial arrangement were rooted in bad economic policies. Mexico's central bank violated sound money principles. Excessive money supply growth was the root cause of the devaluation of the peso. Followup policies of wage and price controls will drive away private investors and hurt Mexican citizens.

My understanding is that Treasury Secretary Rubin has promised the House and Senate Banking Committees a "detailed picture of developments in Mexico" so that Congress can be fully informed of Mexican economic policies and therefore its ability to repay loan obligations. The Treasury is currently required to report to Congress on any disbursements from the exchange stabilization fund. Because of the magnitude of the current commitment, I feel it is necessary for Treasury to provide additional information to the Banking Committee regarding the condition of the Mexican economy and consultations between the Government of Mexico and the International Monetary Fund or the United States Treasury Department. That is why I, with several other Senators, am introducing the Mexican Loan Compliance Resolution.

This resolution will make sure that the information Congress needs to evaluate the Mexican loan is the same information that will be provided by Treasury. The resolution asks for Treasury to provide: Information on monetary policy in Mexico, including potential devaluation plans and information on the Mexican money supply; information on the institution of wage and price controls, changes in tax policy, and privatization efforts; a list of planned or pending Mexican Government regulations affecting the Mexican private sector; and a full disclosure of all financial transactions directly involving funds disbursed from the exchange stabilization fund and the International Monetary Fund.

Just as American voters made clear to our government in November that they wanted change, Mexican voters rallied for change in their election last Sunday. The Institutional Revolutionary Party [PRI], the party of President Zedillo, that delivered the devaluation of the Mexican peso, suffered a bruising defeat. The people in the Mexican state of Jalisco voted overwhelmingly for candidates from the National Action Party [PAN], electing a new governor, achieving a majority in the state legislature, and winning 90 of 124 municipal offices. While only the Mexican people can determine whether the PAN party will fully reflect their desire for change, the Mexican people recognized who was responsible for 40 percent of their purchasing power vanishing with the devaluation, and they held their leaders accountable. The new Congress elected in November recognizes that it's accountable too. By ensuring that Mexico follows policies that will help the Mexican people and strengthen its economy, we will fulfill our obligation to protect United States taxpayers whose dollars are on the line.●

SENATE RESOLUTION 78—RELATIVE TO HALEYVILLE, AL, EMERGENCY 911 DAY

Mr. HEFLIN submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 78

Whereas 27 years ago a new era of providing emergency service was ushered in with the creation of the emergency 911 service;

Whereas the first emergency 911 service in the United States was developed by the independent Alabama Telephone Company, a member of the Continental system;

Whereas the Alabama Telephone Company chose Haleyville, Alabama, as the site of the first emergency 911 service in the United States;

Whereas Haleyville, Alabama, became the birthplace of emergency 911 service on Friday, February 16, 1968, when a demonstration call was made from Alabama Representative Rankin Fite of Hamilton, Alabama, at the